

REMARKS

The indication of allowability of Claims 4 and 5, subject to their being rewritten in independent form is noted with appreciation. By virtue of the foregoing amendment, claim 4 has been rewritten to be in independent form through the inclusion of all of the limitations of the claims upon which it previously depended. Thus it is believed that claims 4 and 5 are now allowable.

Independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to emphasize their distinctions over the cited art and are submitted for reconsideration along with dependent claims 2 and 3, for the reasons now to be set out.

The noted relevance of the Spence et al reference applied by the Examiner is well taken and the claims have been amended to more fully distinguish over it. Spence et al clearly is an attempt to permit simple testing of electronic circuits, but requires the camera output to be interpreted by a complex neural network. Applicant, on the other hand, employs a device that reads the thermal image and directly converts it into a temperature output that requires no further interpretation. The claims have been amended to stress this difference. Thus it is most respectfully submitted that this amendment places the case in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 717-4821
Pacific Time